

Message

---

**From:** Wirick, Holiday [wirick.holiday@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** 7/2/2020 4:12:03 PM  
**To:** Wax, Peter N. [pwax@nd.gov]  
**Subject:** Re: Hg Fish

OK. There are some issues with it though which is what I was going to mention. Litigation in Idaho might result in a methyl mercury number to replace the current 1995 criteria, but who knows when that may be?

Have a great 4th!

Holly

---

**From:** Wax, Peter N. <pwax@nd.gov>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 2, 2020 9:53 AM  
**To:** Wirick, Holiday <wirick.holiday@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Hg Fish

I got it.

---

**From:** Wirick, Holiday  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 1, 2020 1:57 PM  
**To:** Wax, Peter N. <pwax@nd.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Hg Fish

**CAUTION:** This email originated from an outside source. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know they are safe.

Hi Pete, just a quick note to ask if I can respond to you tomorrow? I'm working on a fire drill right now - but great news on the ammonia.

Thanks,  
Holly

---

**From:** Wax, Peter N. <pwax@nd.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 1, 2020 6:44 AM  
**To:** Wirick, Holiday <wirick.holiday@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** Hg Fish

Holly:

What is the EPA recommended Methyl Mercury concentration.

Ammonia has survived the Section Chiefs review. Will be for all waters and removing all site specifics.

Need to explain why we are still protective moving Hg to 304 recommended number.

Pete

Peter N. Wax  
Special Projects

Division of Water Quality

701.328.5268 • [pwax@nd.gov](mailto:pwax@nd.gov) • <https://deq.nd.gov/>

